

REMARKS

Claims 1-5, 7-17 and 19-24 are currently pending in the subject application and are presently under consideration. Claims 1, 17, 20, 23, and 24 have been amended as shown on pp. 2-5 of the Reply.

Applicants' representative thanks the Examiner for the courtesies extended during the telephonic interview on December 20, 2007, between Le V. Nguyen and Applicants' representative Bradley D. Spitz. During the interview, the rejection of claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 10, 11-17, 19-21, and 24 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 was discussed. Further, proposed amendments to independent claims 1, 17, 20, 23, and 24 were discussed.

Favorable reconsideration of the subject patent application is respectfully requested in view of the comments and amendments herein.

I. Rejection of Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 10, 11-17, 19-21 and 24 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 10, 11-17, 19-21 and 24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Moehrle (U.S. 7,191,411) in view of Chu *et al.* (U.S. 2007/0198930). Withdrawal of this rejection is requested for the following reasons. The cited references, either alone or in combination, do not disclose or suggest all features recited in the subject claims.

Independent Claim 1:

Independent claim 1 (and its corresponding dependent claims) relates to a system that facilitates access to data. The system can identify sets of data, such as directories containing computer files, and display a portion of at least one of the sets of data in a semi-collapsed view. Further, items displayed in the semi-collapsed view can be automatically selected to provide a user expedited access to items that are useful in connection with one or more applications being employed by the user. For example, the specification discloses that a user having a word processing application instantiated can view word processing documents in a semi-collapsed state to facilitate selection of relevant documents. (*See* p. 7, ll. 6-9). To this end, independent claim 1 recites a display component that *determines data in at least one data set to be displayed in a semi-*

collapsed view by selecting data in the at least one data set having a type corresponding to one of a plurality of instantiated applications, the plurality of instantiated applications having respective corresponding types. The cited references, either alone or in combination, do not disclose or suggest such features.

Moehrle relates to techniques for expedited browsing of a multi-level hierarchical collapsing menu structure. (See abstract; col. 2, ll. 28-29). As a user selects items to navigate through a hierarchical menu, the selected items are displayed as “active links” in an “Active Path.” (See col. 2, ll. 33-41). Active links in the Active Path can be subsequently selected to facilitate direct access to a corresponding level or item of the hierarchical menu without requiring re-navigation through the menu. (See col. 2, ll. 41-44).

At Page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner interprets the Active Path and active links therein disclosed by Moehrle as a semi-collapsed view of a data set. However, Moehrle is silent as to *determining data to be displayed in a semi-collapsed view by selecting data having a type corresponding to one or more instantiated applications* as recited by independent claim 1. More particularly, Moehrle discloses only that active links in an Active Path can be created by navigation through a collapsible menu structure associated with the Active Path. Thus, selection of items to display in the Active Path is based on the act of navigating an associated menu structure, which is performed independently of respective types of items in the menu structure.

The Examiner additionally relies on Chu *et al.* at Page 2 of the Office Action. Chu *et al.* relates to techniques for customizing the display of a collapsing tree diagram. As disclosed by Chu *et al.*, a user can partially collapse and/or partially expand a tree diagram interface by selecting nodes in the tree diagram to be hidden and/or displayed. (See paragraph 0045). Further, Chu *et al.* discloses that icons can be placed adjacent to a node to indicate that the node is in an expanded, collapsed, or partially expanded state. The icons can further be engaged to change the state of an associated node. (See paragraph 0057). Chu *et al.* additionally discloses that a set of “hot” nodes can be selected such that the set of “hot” nodes can be displayed in a partially collapsed state using a mechanism such as a “Hot Collapse” operation. (See paragraphs 0063-0064).

However, like Mochrle, Chu *et al.* does not disclose or suggest *determining data to be displayed in a semi-collapsed view by selecting data having a type corresponding to one or more instantiated applications* as recited by independent claim 1. While Chu *et al.* does disclose the display of a selected set of “hot” nodes in a partially collapsed state, the reference does not disclose or suggest that “hot” nodes can be selected in relation to applications instantiated by a user. Rather, Chu *et al.* discloses only that “hot” nodes can be directly marked by a user or inferred by determining nodes that have been recently utilized by a user. (See paragraphs 0063, 0065).

Independent Claims 17 and 24:

Independent claims 17 and 24 relate to a method and a system, respectively, for facilitating access to data. Techniques are utilized wherein sets of data items are identified, information in at least one identified data set to be displayed in a semi-collapsed state is identified based on applications being employed by a user, and the identified information is displayed in the semi-collapsed state. To this end, independent claims 17 and 24 respectively recite *identifying information in at least one set of data items to be displayed in a semi-collapsed state at least in part by determining information in the at least one set having an information type that is associated with an application instantiated by a user and means for selecting data in at least one identified set of data for display in a semi-collapsed view at least in part by selecting data in the at least one identified set of data that relates to an application being employed by a user.* These recited features function in a similar manner to the display component recited by independent claim 1. Thus, for similar reasons to those set forth above regarding independent claim 1, the cited references, either alone or in combination, do not disclose or suggest all features recited by independent claims 17 and 24.

Independent Claim 20:

Independent claim 20 relates to a user interface that comprises two portions – a first portion that includes data of a first data set that can be displayed in a semi-collapsed view, and a second portion that includes data of a second data set that can be displayed with data of the first data set in an expanded or collapsed view. Data of the first data set

that are displayed in the semi-collapsed view can be selected based on applications associated with a user. To this end, independent claim 20 recites that items displayed in a semi-collapsed view can be *determined based on respective classifications of the data items and one or more applications associated with a user*. This recited feature functions in a similar manner to the display component recited by independent claim 1. Thus, for similar reasons to those set forth above regarding independent claim 1, the cited references, either alone or in combination, do not disclose or suggest all features recited by independent claim 20.

II. Rejection of Claims 3, 8 and 9 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 3, 8 and 9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Moehrle in view of Chu *et al.* and Screen Dumps of Microsoft Windows XP (“MS XP”). Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested in light of the amendments and remarks directed to independent claim 1 above, from which these claims depend.

III. Rejection of Claim 22 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claim 22 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Moehrle in view of Chu *et al.* and Screen Dumps of East (“East”). Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested in light of the amendments and remarks directed to independent claim 20 above, from which this claim depends.

IV. Rejection of Claim 23 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claim 23 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Moehrle in view of Chu *et al.* and Screen Dumps of IE (“IE”). Withdrawal of this rejection is requested for at least the following reasons. Independent claim 23 relates to a data packet having two fields – a first field containing data of a first data set that can be displayed in a semi-collapsed view, and a second field containing data of a second data set that can be displayed with data of the first data set in an expanded or collapsed view. Data of the first data set that are displayed in the semi-collapsed view can be selected based on applications associated with a user. To this end, independent claim 23 recites that items displayed in a semi-collapsed view can be *selected at least in part by*

identifying respective items in the at least one data set having a type that corresponds to an executing application. This recited feature functions in a similar manner to the display component recited by independent claim 1. Thus, for similar reasons to those set forth above regarding independent claim 1, Moehrle and Chu *et al.* do not disclose or suggest all features recited by independent claim 20. Further, IE, which relates to techniques by which a data packet can be communicated between two or more computers, does not overcome the noted deficiencies of Moehrle and Chu *et al.* Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is requested.

CONCLUSION

The present application is believed to be in condition for allowance in view of the above comments and amendments. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

In the event any fees are due in connection with this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1063.

Should the Examiner believe a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

AMIN & TUROCY, LLP

/Himanshu S. Amin/

Himanshu S. Amin

Reg. No. 40,894

AMIN & TUROCY, LLP
24TH Floor, National City Center
1900 E. 9TH Street
Cleveland, Ohio 44114
Telephone (216) 696-8730
Facsimile (216) 696-8731